



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/169.060 10/09/98 HUELLER

W 10191/822

EXAMINER

HM92/0419

KENYON & KENYON
ONE BROADWAY
NEW YORK NY 10004

REDLEY, P.

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED:

04/19/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/169,060

Applicant(s)

MUELLER ET AL.

Examiner

Peter M Medley

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-18,20-24 and 27-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6,8-18,20-24 and 27-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) _____.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 14) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 15) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 16) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 17) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 18) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 19) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2834

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 2, 11-14, 23-24, and 27-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With respect to claims 2 and 14, it is not clear from the claims what the transistor can be.

With respect to claims 11-12 and 23-24, it is not clear from the claims what constitutes the controlled transistor bridge.

Claims 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: the second transistor has no relationship to any other element.

Claim Objections

3. Claims 29 and 30 are objected to because of the following informalities: in line 4, replace "set-up" with -step-up-. Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2834

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5. Claims 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hamelin et al.

With respect to claims 29, Hamelin discloses a rectifier and a plurality of transistors in **fig. 1**. The reference discloses in the discussion of **fig. 2** in the last paragraph of column 8 that the transistors act as a step-up converter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1-6, 8-10, 13-18, 20-22, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamelin et al.

Hamelin et al discloses a device and method for controlling a generator comprising a diode bridge and transistor **T** in **fig. 11**. The reference also teaches that the signal to the transistor can be varied in lines 25-40 of column 7. The reference also discloses a diode **D7**. Hamelin discloses a rectifier and a plurality of transistors in **fig. 1**. The reference discloses in the discussion of **fig. 2** in the last paragraph of column 8 that the transistors act as a step-up converter. The reference does not disclose a capacitor.

The Examiner takes official notice that capacitors would have been well known in the art for the purpose of conditions the power so that it can be used by the load. It

Art Unit: 2834

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a capacitor for the purpose of conditioning the power so that it can be used by the load.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7 March 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the 112 2nd paragraph rejections of claims 2 and 14, it is not clear from the language and the grammar of the claims if the transistor could be a MOS field effect transistor and a further semiconductor device or a insulated gate bipolar transistor and a further semiconductor device or if the transistor could be a MOS field effect transistor, a insulated gate bipolar transistor, or a further semiconductor device.

With respect to the 112 2nd paragraph rejections of claims 11 and 23, the claims recite that the controlled transistor bridge has one of a free wheeling diode and a first transistor. It is not clear if this means that the bridge has either a free wheeling diode or a first transistor, which does not make sense because it has a second transistor, or if the bridge has one free wheeling diode and one first transistor.

With respect to the Official Notice of using smoothing capacitors. The Applicant is pointed to the Balogh reference and the newly provided Satoh et al reference. In the Balogh reference that a "decoupling" capacitor **C** is used at the voltage detection point. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize this as a smoothing capacitor. As further evidence, the Satoh et al reference has been provided to show a smoothing capacitor **C**, a voltage detection point **A**, and a voltage detection circuit **10**.

Art Unit: 2834

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter M Medley whose telephone number is 703-305-0494. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on 703-308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3432 for regular communications and 703-305-3432 for After Final communications.


Application/Control Number: 09/169,060

Page 6

Art Unit: 2834

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

PM
April 11, 2000


NESTOR RAMIREZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800